

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested. Claims 1, 11, 21, 31, and 37 are amended. Claims 1-40 are pending in the application.

As agreed during the telephonic interview conducted February 29, 2008 with Examiner Alia, attached is a copy of an Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) filed January 3, 2007, along with a stamped PTO receipt (6 pages total). It is respectfully requested that this IDS, filed before the mailing of a first office action on the merits, be considered under MPEP 609.

The specification has been amended to correct informalities. No new matter has been added.

The informality identified in claim 37 is acknowledged with appreciation. It is believed claim 37 as amended is in proper form.

Claims 1-6, 10-16, 20-26, 30-36, and 40 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) in view of the "EIGRP White Paper". It is believed the foregoing amendments to independent claims 1, 11, 21, and 31 clarify the claimed features, and thereby patentably distinguish the independent claims over the EIGRP White Paper.

For example, the EIGRP White Paper does not disclose or suggest detecting "a change in at least one of the prescribed attributes of the connected active path, *the change distinct from and not changing an availability of the active path*". In fact, page 3 of the EIGRP White Paper specifies that "EIGRP, instead of counting on full periodic updates to re-converge, builds a topology table from each of its neighbor's advertisements ... and converges by either looking for a likely loop-free route in the topology table, or, if it knows of no other route, by querying its neighbors. Page 2 of the EIGRP White Paper further describes on page 2 ("EIGRP Theory of Operation") that "when a change occurs, only routing table changes are propagated, not the entire routing table". Further, page 3 of the EIGRP White Paper further specifies that "EIGRP only sends routing updates about paths that have changed when those paths change." In other words, EIGRP only sends routing updates when the link goes down, in order to notify of a change in the

topology table (see, e.g., pages 11-12). Hence, the EIGRP White Paper outputs updates only when a link goes down causing a change in a topology table.

Further, the reference in the rejection to EIGRP sending “hello” packets is not a disclosure of the claimed detecting a change in at least one of the prescribed attributes of the connected active path, the change *distinct from and not changing an availability of the active path*, as claimed. To the contrary, hello packets simply are used to describe the presence of an adjacent node. For example, page 4 of the EIGRP White Paper specifies “EIGRP relies on neighbor relationships to reliably propagate routing table changes throughout the network; two routers become neighbors when they see each other’s hello packets on a common network.” Moreover, page 4 clearly specifies that hello packets are used to determine whether a neighboring router is “alive”: “[t]he rate at which EIGRP sends hello packets is called the hello interval ... [and the] hold time is the amount of time that a router will consider a neighbor alive without receiving a hello packet.”

Hence, the “hello packet” is used by a router to determine whether a neighboring router is “alive”. There is no disclosure or suggestion of the hello packet enabling a router to detect a change in a prescribed attribute of a connected active path that is *distinct from and not changing an availability of the active path*, as claimed.

For these and other reasons, the §102 rejection of independent claims 1, 11, 21, and 31 should be withdrawn.

It is believed the dependent claims are allowable in view of the foregoing.

In view of the above, it is believed this application is in condition for allowance, and such a Notice is respectfully solicited.

To the extent necessary, Applicant petitions for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including any missing or insufficient fees under 37 C.F.R. 1.17(a), to Deposit Account No. 50-1130, under Order No. 10-009, and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'L R Turkevich', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Leon R. Turkevich
Registration No. 34,035

Customer No. 23164
(202) 261-1059
Date: April 28, 2008